

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending in the present application.

The January 12, 2006 Office Action rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (U.S. 6,249,682).

Claim 1 is novel in view of Kubo because Kubo does not disclose a "pilot filter" or a "method of adapting a pilot filter," as recited in Claim 1. The Office Action cited Fig. 10 and col. 7, lines 9-31 of Kubo, but Fig. 10 and col. 7, lines 9-31 do not mention a "pilot." Fig. 10 and col. 7, lines 9-31 of Kubo show a "moving average filter 243" that receives a "transmission power control (TPC)" command, not a pilot. There is no suggestion in Kubo that the "moving average filter 243" in Fig. 10 could filter a "pilot." Kubo also fails to disclose "determining one or more coefficients of the pilot filter based on the determined velocity of the wireless communication device," as recited in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants performed an electronic search through Kubo and did not find "pilot filter." Thus, Claim 1 should be allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claims 2-9, 20, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (U.S. 6,249,682) in view of Akiyama (U.S. 6,907,026).

As stated above, Kubo does not disclose or teach Claim 1. Akiyama, alone or in combination with Kubo, also fails to teach Claim 1. The Office Action cited col. 4, lines 36-51, col. 11, lines 37-67, col. 12, lines 1-35 and Fig. 6 of Akiyama, but these lines and Fig. 6 of Akiyama do not disclose a "pilot filter" or a "method of adapting a pilot filter," as recited in Claim 1. Applicants performed an electronic search through Akiyama and did not find "pilot filter." Thus, Claims 2-9 should be allowable.

Claim 20 depends on Claim 16, which recites a "pilot filter" and "a controller that determines filter coefficients of the pilot filter based on the wireless communication device velocity and adapts the pilot filter to the communication channel." Kubo and Akiyama do not teach the "pilot filter" and "controller" of Claim 16. Thus, Claim 20 should be allowable.

Claim 30 depends on Claim 24, which recites "a plurality of pilot filters" and "a controller configured to select one of the plurality of pilot filter outputs based on the wireless

PATENT

communication device velocity.” Kubo and Akiyama do not disclose the “pilot filters” and “controller” of Claim 24. Thus, Claim 30 should be allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 10-12, 15-19, 21, 24-29, 31, 36-38, 40-42, 44-46, and 49-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (U.S. 6,249,682) in view of Akiyama (U.S. 6,907,026) and further in view of Corbett et al. (U.S. 6,351,642).

As stated above, Kubo and Akiyama do not disclose or teach Claim 1. Corbett, alone or in combination with Kubo and Akiyama, also fails to teach Claim 1 because Corbett does not disclose a “pilot filter” or a “method of adapting a pilot filter,” as recited in Claim 1. Applicants performed an electronic search through Corbett and did not find “filter” or “pilot filter.” Claims 10-12, 15 and 50-53 depend on Claim 1 and should be allowable.

As stated above, Kubo and Akiyama do not disclose or teach Claim 16. Corbett also fails to teach the “pilot filter” and “controller” of Claim 16. Thus, Claims 16-19, 21 and 54 should be allowable.

As stated above, Kubo and Akiyama do not disclose or teach Claim 24. Corbett also fails to teach the “pilot filters” and “controller” of Claim 24. Thus, Claims 24-29 and 31 should be allowable.

Claims 35, 39 and 43 recite a “pilot filter.” As stated above, Kubo, Akiyama and Corbett do not disclose or teach a “pilot filter.” Claims 36-38 depend from Claim 35 and should be allowable. Claims 40-42 depend on Claim 39 and should be allowable. Claims 44-46 and 49 depend on Claim 43 and should be allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 35, 39, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akiyama (U.S. 6,907,026) in view of Corbett et al. (U.S. 6,351,642).

As stated above, Akiyama and Corbett do not teach the “pilot filter” of Claims 35, 39, and 43. The Office Action cited col. 7, lines 9-31 of Akiyama and col. 4, lines 1-67 of Corbett, but these lines do not teach the “pilot filter” of Claims 35, 39, and 43.

The Office Action rejected claims 13-14, 22-23, 32-34, 47-48, and 50-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubo et al. (U.S. 6,249,682) in view of Agazzi et al. (Pub. No. 2001/0000219).

PATENT

As stated above, Kubo does not disclose or teach Claims 1, 16, 24 and 43. Agazzi also fails to teach a "pilot filter," as recited in Claims 1, 16, 24 and 43. Applicants performed an electronic search through Agazzi and did not find "pilot" or "pilot filter." Claims 13-14 and 50-53 depend on Claim 1 and should be allowable. Claims 22-23 and 54 depend on Claim 16 and should be allowable. Claims 32-34 depend on Claim 24 and should be allowable. Claims 47-48 depend on Claim 43 and should be allowable.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 12, 2006

By: 

Alex C. Chen, Reg. No. 45,591
Telephone: (858) 651-5363

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502